

**REMARKS****Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-18 are objected to because of numerous grammatical errors. Claim 17 is objected to because the limitations “the first error provided by the recording head units,” “the second error provided by the recording head arrays,” and “the third error provided by the recording heads” lack antecedent basis. Claims 1-9, 12, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,805,183 to Lidke et al. (“Lidke”). Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lidke in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,243,109 to Ishinaga et al. (“Ishinaga”). Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lidke in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,243,109 to Ishinaga (“Ishinaga”). Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lidke in view of JP 6-31923 to Ishikawa (“Ishikawa”).

Claims 10, 11, 13, 14, and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and to overcome any objections.

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Claims 1-10, 12-13 and 15-18 have been amended to correct numerous grammatical errors. Claim 17 has been amended to correct the lack of antecedent basis for the limitations “the first error provided by the recording head units,” “the second error provided by the recording head arrays,” and “the third error provided by the recording heads.” Claims 10, 13, and 16 have been rewritten in independent form. New claim 19 has been added.

**The Claims Do Not Contain Objectionable Subject Matter**

Claims 1-18 stand objected to because of numerous grammatical errors. Grammatical errors and wording have been changed to avoid possible confusion. E.g., the phrase “a recording medium which is conveyed to a first direction by discharging droplets ...” has been changed to “a recording medium which is conveyed in a first direction past discharging droplets ...“ to avoid the misinterpretation of the phrase to mean that the recording medium is propelled by the force of discharging droplets. Claim 17 has been amended to correct the lack of antecedent basis for the phrases “the first error provided by the recording head units,” “the second error provided by the recording head arrays,” and “the third error provided by the recording heads.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to claims 1-18 be withdrawn.

**All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

The Examiner has stated for claims 1-9, 12, and 18 that “the recording apparatus does not further limit the claims, which are directed towards the apparatus for correcting ink droplets placement errors for a recording apparatus.” Independent claims 1, 5, 8 and 12 have been amended to explicitly claim the recording apparatus as part of a system for correcting ink droplet errors rather than merely including the description of the recording apparatus in the preamble. Lidke does not disclose an arrangement of an array of recording heads as now claimed in claims 1-9 and 12, but instead teaches two printer heads 84, 86 on a carriage assembly transported by a drive belt 70 across the width of the paper. (Lidke at col. 8, lines 50-58). Although Lidke teaches the possibility of multi-head printing, it describes the same carriage assembly traveling back and forth (as contrasted with the array of relatively stationary recording heads of the present

invention) and even points out problems inherent in such an arrangement. (*Id.* at col. 14, line 66 – col. 15, line 27). Lidke in no way anticipates the array of recording heads described and claimed in claims 1-9 and 12. Similarly, claim 18 claims a correcting method for correcting ink droplet placement for a recording system using an array of recording heads not described in or anticipated by Lidke. Claim 18 has been amended to further clarify the differences between the claimed invention and Lidke. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-9, 12, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn for at least the above reasons.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lidke in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,243,109 to Ishinaga (“Ishinaga”). Applicants assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of claim 15 should be withdrawn because claim 15 is dependent from claim 12.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 10, 11, 13, 14, and 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and to overcome any objections. Applicants thank the Examiner for his finding of allowable matter in the claims and assert that claims 10 and 13 have been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and to overcome any objections. Claim 16 has been rewritten to be dependent from claim 13 so that it should also be allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to claims 10, 13, and dependent claims 11, 14, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn for at least the above reasons.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lidke in view of JP 6-31923 to Ishikawa (“Ishikawa”). Ishikawa displays only a single printing head 10 inclined to offset nozzle arrays and not an array of multiple recording head units as described in the specification of the present invention and claimed in claim 17. Even if such an array of recording heads were disclosed in Ishikawa, there is no motivation in either reference to combine the Lidke and Ishikawa references. As stated in *In re Fitch*, 277 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2002), obviousness can be demonstrated “only by showing some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art that would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references.” *Id.* at 1345. Similarly, Ishikawa does not overcome Lidke’s lack of description of an array of recording heads in regard to claims 1-9, 12, 15, and 18.

Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn for at least the above reasons.

Applicants further respectfully assert that new claim 19 adds no new matter and is allowable over Lidke. Support for claim 19 may be found in pages 3-7 of the specification of present invention, for example.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

Dated: October 13, 2005

By:   
Kent Basson  
Registration No. 48,125

**CUSTOMER NO. 009629**  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
202.739.3000